

REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed March 7, 2007. Claims 1, 11, and 21 have been amended, claim 4 has been cancelled without prejudice, and claims 25-29 have been added. Claims 1, 5-11, and 14-29 are presently pending. No new matter has been added.

§ 103 Rejections

Claims 1, 4-8, 11, 14-18, 21-22, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over PCT Patent Application Publication No. WO 00/04707 to Ellis et al. ("Ellis") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,785,901 to Horiwitz et al. ("Horiwitz"). Claims 9-10, 19-20, and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Ellis and Horiwitz and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0059253 to Goodman et al. ("Goodman"). The Applicants traverse these rejections.

Claim 1 recites a system that is configured to provide a change in configuration of any of the user objects to all of the client systems without further activity from the user and without the user selecting the plurality of client systems to provide the change. Such updating (without requiring specific user direction) is valuable to make certain that each client system has the most complete set of user objects.

Ellis, on the other hand, takes a different approach. When changes are made to parental controls, etc., the user specifies on which devices the changes will be made. See, e.g., Ellis, Fig. 14, step 1001; Fig. 17, step 1024; Figs. 18a, 18b, 21, 24, 27, and 31-33 (reference numerals 205, 206, 207, and 209); Fig. 23, step 1031. For example, the user may have a choice to specify "Apply to Current Location" or "Apply to All" or "Apply to Select Locations". Thus, in contrast to claim 1 Ellis requires the user to select the client system(s) to which a change will be made. Accordingly, Ellis does not teach or suggest updating all of the client systems without requiring the user to select the client systems to update as recited in claim 1.

Horiwitz and Goodman do not address this deficiency of Ellis. For at least these reasons, claim 1, as well as claims 5-10 which depend therefrom, are patentable over the cited references. The Applicants request withdrawal of the rejections of these claims.

Claim 11 recites that each user object is configured to store at least one user name and password to allow the corresponding user to access services from at least one partner of a television service provider. This arrangement can facilitate commerce because the user object can store a user name and password for a partner company so that the user can conduct a transaction with the partner company without entering the user name/password as they can be automatically retrieved from the user object.

None of the cited references teach or suggest that each user object can store a user name and password for a partner company of a television service provider. For at least these reasons, claim 11, as well as claims 12-20 which depend therefrom, are patentable over the cited references. The Applicants request withdrawal of the rejections of these claims.

Claim 21 recites that each user object is configured to include an individual e-mail address. This arrangement allows each user object to receive private e-mail, if desired, using the individual e-mail address.

None of the cited references teach or suggest that each user object can include an individual e-mail address. For at least these reasons, claim 21, as well as claims 22-29 which depend therefrom, are patentable over the cited references. The Applicants request withdrawal of the rejections of these claims.

By Bruce E. Black
 Bruce E. Black
 Registration No.: 41,622
 DARBY & DARBY P.C.
 P.O. Box 770
 Church Street Station
 New York, New York 10008-0770
 (206) 262-8900
 (212) 527-7701 (Fax)
 Attorneys/Agents For Applicant